



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,052	03/31/2004	Jesper Kichn	M61.12-0615	7946

7590 01/31/2005

John Veldhuis-Kroeze
Westman, Champlin & Kelly
Suite 1600
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER

HOFFMAN, BRANDON S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2136

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/815,052

Applicant(s)

KIEHN ET AL.

Examiner

Brandon Hoffman

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/31/04

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 18, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boozer et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0205355 A1).

Regarding claims 1, 18, and 34, Boozer et al. teaches a method/system/computer readable medium for providing Resource-Event-Agent (REA) model based security, the method/system/computer readable medium comprising:

- Identifying an association between a first object and a second object in an REA model (page 1, paragraph 0016);
- Creating an association class for the association between the first object and second object, the association class defining security between the first object and the second object (page 1, paragraph 0018).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-17, 19-33, and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boozer et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0205355 A1) in view of Colburn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,404).

Regarding claims 2, 19, and 35, Boozer et al. teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 18, and 34, respectively, above. However, Boozer et al. does not teach wherein creating the association class for the association between the first object and the second object further comprises creating an association class object having properties, the properties of the association class object defining the security between the first object and the second object.

Colburn et al. teaches wherein creating the association class for the association between the first object and the second object further comprises creating an association class object having properties, the properties of the association class object defining the security between the first object and the second object (col. 6, lines 42-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine creating an association class object having properties, the properties of the association class object defining the security between the first object and the second object, as taught by Colburn et al., with the method/system/computer readable medium of Boozer et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because objects have properties that define the attributes of the object. The attributes define the object and therefore define the security between the two objects.

Regarding claims 3, 20, and 36, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al. teaches wherein creating the association class object further comprises creating one or more association class objects having properties, properties of the one or more association class objects defining security between a first class of objects of which the first object is a member and a second class of objects of which the second object is a member (see col. 6, lines 42-52 of Colburn et al.).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al. teaches wherein the second object is a securable object (see page 1, paragraph 0018 of Boozer et al., the objects may have security parents).

Regarding claims 5 and 21, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al. teaches wherein the first object is of a particular agent type, and wherein a role for a

Art Unit: 2136

user is defined by the particular agent type for the first object (see page 6, paragraph 0066 and 0076 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 6-10 and 22-26, official notice is taken that wherein the second object is a contract or agreement type object, a commitment type object, an event type object, a resource type object, and an agent type object is an obvious modification to the method/system/computer readable medium of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the different object types that are specific to an REA model with the method/system/computer readable medium of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al. because REA is just one of many modeling methods. Boozer et al. and Colburn et al. use different modeling methods, but mention different object types. The specific object types of the claim are particular of REA.

Regarding claims 11, 12, 27, and 28, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al. teaches wherein identifying the association between the first object and the second object further comprises identifying a [control type/custody type] association between the first object and the second object (see page 1, paragraph 0016 and page 3, paragraph 0033 of Boozer et al., control meaning 'ownership' and custody meaning 'template').

Regarding claims 13 and 29, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al. teaches wherein creating the association class for the association between the first object and the second object further comprises creating the association class in a security model (see page 1, paragraph 0016 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 14, 30, and 37, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al. teaches wherein creating the association class in the security model further comprises creating the association class in the security model separate from the REA model (see fig. 19, ref. num 1200 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 15, 31, and 38, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al. teaches wherein creating the association class in the security model further comprises creating the association class in the security model as part of the REA model (see fig. 2 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 16, 32, and 39, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al. teaches wherein defining security between the first object and the second object further comprises defining permissions and rights of the first object relative to the second object (see page 2/3, paragraph 0029 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 17 and 33, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al. teaches wherein defining permissions and rights of the first object relative to the

Art Unit: 2136

second object further comprises dynamically determining the permissions and rights in a security policy logic module outside of the security model (see col. 5, line 65 through col. 6, line 13 of Colburn et al.).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brandon Hoffman

BH

Kim Vu
KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 21